

Date: Sat, 11 Sep 93 04:30:11 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #331
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 11 Sep 93 Volume 93 : Issue 331

Today's Topics:

 Aspiring hams: We're not this bad!
 Codeless Technician (3 msgs)
 Neighborhood watch groups
 New part 97.113 ?
 Part 97.. Repost please
Wayne w2nsd and 73 Magazine (was: RIF (sic) RAFF)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 1993 15:12:58 GMT
From: agate!spool.mu.edu!mixcom.com!kevin.jessup@ames.arpa
Subject: Aspiring hams: We're not this bad!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Just a note to any aspiring amateur radio operators (who plan
on taking the no-code technician route) out there who have been
unfortunate enough to stumble across "rec.radio.amateur.policy"...

A lot of bashing occurs in this area against the TECHNICIAN class
license holder and against those who would like to see the end of
the Morse code requirement. To be fair, many have also attacked
those who prefer to operate CW.

There have been people on both sides of the issue who have presented
interesting and thought-provoking arguments. There have also been a
few who come across as complete jerks and who would probably get

their intellectual butts kicked by a 3rd-string member of the high-school debate team! ;-) As a "no-code" technician who is also an EE, I enjoy occasionally participating in this on-going "debate".

Anyway, please DO NOT let any of this discourage you from entering amateur radio. I have regularly attended meetings in at least five different amateur radio clubs/organizations here in the Milwaukee area and only in ONE of them have I found a club officer (or members) who were vocally anti-technician class (against the "no-code" tech licence).

While many of the amateurs on the local repeaters probably have strong opinions one way or the other, I have found that most everyone gets along very well and are eager to help each other in ANY amateur radio related endeavor be it CW or purely technical (non code-related).

A phenomenon of Internet (and the electronic message passing ozone in general) is the "Dr. Jekyll to Mr. Hyde" transformation that some people go through when they enter into a debate!

If you've been on Internet for a while and have frequented any area where the discussions get heated (such as alt.politics.clinton, alt.discrimination, and ofcourse rec.radio.amateur.policy) you will discover that the people who actually CHANGE their opinion based on the discussions are few and far between. Generally, such areas server only to vent one's frustrations and/or polish one's debating skills, IMHO.

Again, please consider such debates (and I myself have participated in a few of them) the exception and not the rule in amateur radio and consider joining us. It's really quite fun.

And by all means, stay away from rec.radio.amateur.policy! ;-))

--

Kevin Jessup, N9SQB "A bad day of DXing is better than a good day at work."

The U.S. Constitution defines the rights the people
give to the government, not the reverse!

Date: 10 Sep 93 18:31:09 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!ginews!don@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Codeless Technician
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>ehare is absolutely right. Just because someone likes CW, doesn't mean
>they're an old fart.
>
>COnversely, just because some people like CW is no reason to make it a legal
>requirement for advancement of license privileges. Nor should people who
>do not wish to operate CW be insulted for their choice.
>
>Respect is a 2 way street.
>

I have refrained from entering the fray on CW vs. no CW as a
licensing requirement, but the above argument touched me as being
absolutely silly. By this argument, if the only mode I am
interested in is CW, then I should not be required to have any
questions on my exam about radiotelephone communications, or packet
operation, or any other mode!!!

The licensing process is meant to test a potential licensee on all
aspects of amateur radio. CW is an aspect of amateur radio. Live
with it.

Donald D. Woelz, K9GR
GENROCO, Inc.
205 Kettle Moraine Drive North
Slinger, WI 53086 U.S.A.

Office Phone: 414-644-8700
K9GR @WB9TYT.#MKE.WI.USA.NOAM
k9gr@k9gr.ampr.org [44.92.1.48]
don@genroco.com

Date: Fri, 10 Sep 93 11:12:08 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!torn!nott!cunews!
revcan!balsam!cowan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Codeless Technician
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

> ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare - KA1CV) writes:
>
> > Why do you feel that the best way to get more freedom to enjoy ham
> > radio the way YOU like is to insult others for the way they do things.
> > I enjoy CW. I can do that! I don't think that anyone should insult me
> > by calling me an old fart just because I do.
>
> I second the motion.

ehare is absolutely right. Just because someone likes CW, doesn't mean
they're an old fart.

COnversely, just because some people like CW is no reason to make it a legal

requirement for advancement of license privileges. Nor should people who do not wish to operate CW be insulted for their choice.

Respect is a 2 way street.

--

Darin Cowan - cowan@balsam.pinetree.org | I just try to make people's
VE3 OIJ | lives a little more surreal

Date: Thu, 09 Sep 93 09:11:09 CDT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!
robert@ames.arpa
Subject: Codeless Technician
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare - KA1CV) writes:

> Why do you feel that the best way to get more freedom to enjoy ham
> radio the way YOU like is to insult others for the way they do things.
> I enjoy CW. I can do that! I don't think that anyone should insult me
> by calling me an old fart just because I do.

I second the motion.

--Robert

Date: 10 Sep 93 21:55:20 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!wupost!cs.utexas.edu!oakhill!spud!geraldg@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Neighborhood watch groups
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

A coworker came to me today and asked if it was possible to use ham radio as means of communication for a neighborhood watch group. Would someone please tell me if they are aware if this violates some section of Part 97? There is no money involved (i.e., no one is getting paid for their time or service). Also, he indicated all the volunteers are willing to earn the Technician class license. They want to stay away from CB (I don't blame them, as lots of bad guys use CB nowadays), and I don't know if the little 6m walkie talkies have enough flexibility for their needs.

If they do pursue this path, does anyone have a recommendation for a 70cm band HT with extended receive capabilities (the Austin PD uses channels around 470 MHz)?

They would like to be able to monitor calls and transmit their traffic on a single unit.

Please cc: me if you choose to post a reply - thanks.

73,
Gerald

Gerald W. Garcia, P.E. N5UMB
Senior Design Engineer
geraldg@spud.sps.mot.com
(512) 891-2806 (voice)

Motorola Inc., MD: TX30/OE37
6501 Wm. Cannon Dr. West
Austin, TX 78735-8598
(512) 891-8315 (fax)

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 1993 17:15:13 GMT
From: telesoft!garym@uunet.uu.net
Subject: New part 97.113 ?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>> When does the new FCC Part 97.113 rules go into effect?
> September 12, 1993

>> Where on the net is there a copy of the entire Part 97, including the
>> new part 97.113? info@arrl.org does not have one. :-(

The following is the 1993 change to FCC rule 97.113

97.113 Prohibited transmissions.

(a) No amateur station shall transmit:

(1) Communications specifically prohibited elsewhere in this Part:

(2) Communications for hire or for material compensation, direct or indirect, paid or promised, except as otherwise provided in these rules;

(3) Communications in which the station licensee or control operator has a pecuniary interest, including communications on behalf of an employer. Amateur operators may, however, notify other amateur operators of the availability for sale or trade, of apparatus normally used in an amateur station, provided that such activity is not conducted on a regular basis;

(4) Music using a phone emission except as specifically provided elsewhere in this Section; Communications intended to facilitate a

criminal act; Messages in codes or ciphers intended to obscure the meaning thereof, except as otherwise provided herein; Obscene or indecent words or language; or false or deceptive messages, signals, or identification;

(5) Communications, on a regular basis, which could reasonably be furnished alternatively through other radio services.

(b) An amateur station shall not engage in any form of broadcasting, nor may an amateur station transmit one-way communications except as specifically provided in these rules; nor shall an amateur station engage in any activity related to program production or newsgathering for broadcasting purposes, except that communications directly related to the immediate safety of human life or the protection of property may be provided by amateur stations to broadcasters for dissemination to the public where no other means of communication is reasonably available before or at the time of the event.

(c) A control operator may accept compensation as an incident of a teaching position during periods of time when an amateur station is used by that teacher as a part of classroom instruction at an educational institution.

(d) A control operator of a club station may accept compensation for the periods of time when the station is transmitting telegraphy practice or information bulletins, provided that the station transmits such telegraphy practice and bulletins for at least 40 hours per week; schedules operations on at least six amateur service MF and HF bands using reasonable measures to maximize coverage; where the schedule of normal operating times and frequencies is published at least 30 days in advance of the actual transmissions; and where the control operator does not accept any direct or indirect compensation for any other service as a control operator.

(e) No station shall retransmit programs or signals emanating from any type of radio station other than an amateur station, except propagation and weather forecast information intended for use by the general public and originated from United States Government stations,

and communications, including incidental music, originating on United States Government frequencies between a space shuttle and its associated Earth stations. Prior approval for shuttle retransmissions must be obtained from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Such retransmissions must be for the exclusive use of amateur operators. Propagation, weather forecasts, and shuttle retransmissions may not be conducted on a regular basis, but only occasionally, as an incident of normal amateur radio communications.

(f) No amateur station, except an auxiliary, repeater or space station, may automatically retransmit the radio signals of other amateur stations.

Gary Morris KK6YB
San Diego, CA USA

Internet: garym@alsys.com
Phone: +1 619-457-2700 x128 (work)

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 1993 09:35:40 EDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!
saturn.caps.maine.edu!maine.maine.edu!suseea@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Part 97.. Repost please
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I have found an old copy of Part 97 on the net.... but missed
the post of the new one. Please repost if you have it or
email a copy direct please.
Thanx a bunch.

Date: Thu, 9 Sep 1993 13:24:37 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!
cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ennews!anasaz!misty!john@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Wayne w2nsd and 73 Magazine (was: RIF (sic) RAFF)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@hwking.cca.CR.rockwell.COM writes:

]>he makes many very valid points in his monthly diatribe. You seem to disagree
]>with his prognosis of the future of amateur radio. What makes you think it'll
]>be so great? We are going to lose some of our bands, it is merely a matter
]>of time. Just because you disagree with him is no reason to want him off the
]>air.

Wayne's stuff is old hat and has the discordant combination of puffing his
huge ego and slamming the ARRL about anything and everything.

]the current 73 mag folks just don't seem to have the lust for the hobby these
]days. it's a dead pasttime for them so they work to make it a dead pasttime
]for others? wonder if cassidy's quit smoking yet?

I think, from my conversations with David Cassidy last year, that he
is quite interested in ham radio, and also that he is well intentioned (if
somewhat misguided).

--

John Moore NJ7E, 7525 Clearwater Pkwy, Scottsdale, AZ 85253 (602-951-9326)
john@anasazi.com ncar!noao!asuvax!anasaz!john anasaz!john@asuvax.eas.asu.edu
- - If a field of study has the word "science" in it - it isn't a science - -
- - Support ALL of the bill of rights, INCLUDING the 2nd amendment! - -

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #331
